



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/538,012	03/29/2000	Carole Dulong	42390.P6156	6257

7590 09/09/2003

Thomas C Webster
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

COLLINS, SCOTT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	11

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/538,012	DULONG, CAROLE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott M. Collins	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment C on 08/18/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 14-17, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin).

4. Referring to claim 1, Austin has taught a method for performing a gather operation on a computer processor comprising:

a. computing addresses for a plurality of data elements of a matrix stored in a memory (Austin column 1, line 25 – column 2, line 50; column 5, lines 49-70; and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);

b. retrieving each of said data elements from memory based on the computed addresses (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and

c. executing a plurality of instructions, each instruction depositing one or more of said data elements contiguously with other data elements in a storage location (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

Further, it can be seen from Austin column 1, lines 10-24, column 2, lines 56-57 and column 6, lines 40-42 that Austin expressly discloses the scattering RSV instruction while not fully

Art Unit: 2143

disclosing the details of the gathering RGV instruction since it is simply the inverse of the fully disclosed scattering RSV instruction.

5. Referring to claims 2 and 15, Austin has taught the method and the computer system wherein said storage locations are registers (Austin column 1, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 49-73 and figure 1, elements 19, 52, 75. It should also be noted that the basic data storage unit is a register and would inherently be used to store these data elements).

6. Referring to claims 3 and 16, Austin has taught the method and the computer system wherein computing addresses comprises:

a. extracting indices for each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, increment value 101 acting as a calculated index); and

b. adding each of said indices to a base address (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 and start address 52 which acts as a base address.).

7. Referring to claims 4 and 17, Austin has taught the method and the computer system further comprising loading each of said data elements from memory into separate storage locations prior to executing said plurality of instructions (Austin column 2, lines 51-57, column 5, lines 49-70. Further, it can be seen from Austin column 2, lines 56-57 and column 6, lines 40-42 that Austin expressly discloses the scattering RSV instruction while not fully disclosing the details of the gathering RGV instruction since it is simply the inverse of the fully disclosed scattering RSV instruction.).

8. Referring to claim 8, Austin has taught a method for performing a scatter operation on a computer processor comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

a. calculating addresses in memory to which a plurality of data elements are to be scattered to form a matrix in memory (Austin column 1, line 25 – column 2, line 50; column 5, lines 49-70; and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);

b. executing a plurality of instructions, each of said instructions extracting one or more of said data elements from a separate storage location in which said data elements are stored contiguously (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and

c. storing said data elements to said addresses in memory (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

9. Referring to claim 9, Austin has taught the method wherein said storage locations are registers (Austin column 1, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 49-73 and figure 1, elements 19, 52, 75. It should also be noted that the basic data storage unit is a register and would inherently be used to store these data elements).

10. Referring to claim 10, Austin has taught the method wherein calculating addresses comprises:

a. extracting indices for each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, increment value 101 acting as a calculated index); and

b. adding each of said indices to a base address (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 and start address 52 which acts as a base address.).

11. Referring to claim 11, Austin has taught the method wherein storing each of said data elements is accomplished via a plurality of STORE instructions executed by said computer

Art Unit: 2143

processor (Austin column 5, lines 49-55 where Austin's RSV instruction corresponds to applicant's EXTRACT instruction.).

12. Referring to claim 14, Austin has taught a computer system comprising:

- a. a memory (Austin figure 1, memory 16);
- b. a processor communicatively coupled to the memory (Austin figure 1, all elements beside memory 16 comprise the processor); and
- c. a storage device communicatively coupled to the processor and having stored therein a sequence of instructions (Austin figure 1, memory 16 and column 1, lines 10-35)

which, when executed by the processor, causes the processor to at least,

1. compute addresses for a plurality of data elements of a matrix stored in memory (Austin column 1, line 25 – column 2, line 50; column 5, lines 49-70; and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);
2. retrieve each of said data elements from memory based on the computed addresses (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and
3. execute a plurality of instructions, each instruction to deposit one or more of said data elements contiguously with other data elements in a storage location (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

13. Referring to claim 21, Austin has taught the method wherein computing addresses comprises executing a series of instructions, each instruction to extract an address index for one of said plurality of data elements (Austin column 5, lines 71-73 where execution of the instruction is repeated until address computation is complete.).

Art Unit: 2143

14. Referring to claim 22, Austin has taught the method wherein said address indices are extracted from a series of contiguous memory locations (Austin column 5, lines 49-70 where Austin's RSV scatter instruction takes a contiguous set of memory and scatters it to a discontiguous set of memory.).

15. Referring to claim 23, Austin has taught the method wherein computing addresses comprises adding each of said address indices to a base address (Austin column 5, lines 65-70 where Austin's "working address" is the base address.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 5, 7, 12, 13, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin).

18. Referring to claims 5 and 18, Austin has not disclosed the method nor the computer system wherein said computer processor executes two or more of said instructions in a single clock cycle. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement this scatter method in a modern superscalar computer system having an IPC (instructions per clock) of less than 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have a faster and more efficient processing system.

19. Referring to claims 7, 13, and 20, Austin has not disclosed the method nor the computer system wherein said registers are 64-bits wide and said data elements are 16-bits in length. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store data elements of 16-bits length in 64-bit wide registers, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

20. Referring to claim 12, Austin has not disclosed the method wherein said computer processor executes two or more of said instructions in a single clock cycle. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement this scatter method in a modern superscalar computer system having an IPC (instructions per clock) of less than 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have a faster and more efficient processing system.

21. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin) in view of McDonnell et al., U.S. Patent Number 2,968,027 (herein referred to as McDonnell).

22. Referring to claims 6 and 19, McDonnell has taught the method and the computer system further comprising storing each of said data elements on a mass storage device (McDonnell column 7, lines 23-28 and figure 1a, tape units 1-6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a mass storage device as McDonnell has disclosed in the gather-scatter system Austin has disclosed. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a more modern mass storage device –

such as a hard disk, etc. – as opposed to McDonnell's tape units. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this portion of McDonnell's system into Austin's system because Austin repeatedly points a reader of his patent to McDonnell's system as the basis of his system (Austin column 1, lines 19-24, column 2, lines 33-38 and 45-46, column 3, lines 56-57).

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed 08/18/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the newly added limitation "computing addresses for a plurality of data elements of a matrix stored in memory utilizing a plurality of indices and a base address" has not been taught by the Austin reference. However, it can be seen from column 1, line 25 – column 2, line 50 of Austin that utilizing a plurality of indices and a base address has been the standard method of performing record scatter and record gather operations for over 40 years. In this section of the reference, Austin details how consecutive data words are scattered (or the inherent inverse of gathering) to various locations in memory based on the record definition words (RDWs) (specifically, Austin column 1, lines 25-35). These various locations are calculated by adding an index to a base address just as applicant has claimed (Austin column 1, line 36 – column 2, line 24). Just to make sure the applicant and the examiner are in clear communication, it should be noted that a plurality is constituted by any number of specified items greater than one (thus, two apples form a plurality of apples).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Collins whose telephone number is 703.305.7865. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am - 5:30 pm with alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703.308.5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

smc
September 4, 2003



DAVID A WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100